

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Reina Rodriguez,

Defendant.

Case No. 13 CR 0466 JSW

STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING  
TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

APR 24 2014

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND


For the reason stated by the parties on the record on 4-24-14, 2014, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from 4-24-14, 2014, to May 13, 2014 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).
- \_\_\_\_\_ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to *[circle applicable reasons]* the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- ✓ \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_\_ For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d).


IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 4/24, 2014


STIPULATED:



Attorney for Defendant



Hon. Kandis A. Westmore  
United States Magistrate Judge



Christina McCall  
Assistant United States Attorney